

HISTORY - CHAPTER 7

FROM 1890 TO THE PRESENT

PROF JOANNE PASSET

(**Abstract:** late 19th c, immigration, society in flux, the Progressive Era, the Great Depression, Cold War, a new post war culture, civil rights, Johnson and the Great Society, the modern era and its swing toward more traditional values.)

PROF PASSET: In our last history session we saw how America was dramatically transformed in the years between the civil war and World War I. Because of industrialization, significant changes began to feed each other. There was the transportation revolution, the communication revolution; factories developing. There was rural to urban migration. Remember that the United States was a rural world nation from its conception until 1920 when the nation became more urban than rural. Most historians look at this as a turning point in the nation.

Immigration obviously was a big factor that fed industrialization. It also fed urbanization. It was shaping the contours of American cities and immigration would continue to grow at a rapid pace. When I teach immigration to my students I talk about the different phases of immigration to the U.S. Earlier in the 19th century many of the immigrants were of British and Northern European extraction. They were more like the original settlers. While they might have been distinctly Irish or German, there were already people in the U.S. that these immigrants could assimilate with.

In about 1890 immigration changes. More immigrants arrived from Eastern Europe and Russia. Immigrants began to arrive whose skin color was darker, who spoke different languages and who had different religious practices. More Jewish immigrants, Orthodox immigrants, many different religions and customs began to arrive in the late 19th century.

In response to this influx, a movement in the United States arose that sought to resist the many different cultures coming to the country. Those that were already there had concerns about the new immigrants taking jobs. Others were concerned about assimilation. Finally in 1924 the immigration laws were changed, reverting back to the limits and quotas that the U.S. had earlier when most of the immigrants were coming from Northern Europe.

Virtually no American was unaffected by these major changes; changes that were too often oversimplified as “continuous progress.” Historians debate this all the time. Is that period a narrative of progress or is it a narrative that is more varied, with ups and downs and much more complexity?

All of these major transformations of American life were occurring in the years leading up to World War I during which the United States was beginning to have more influence militarily and economically.

You can look at this period as a time of modernization; a period when the US was transformed from a nation of island communities, where individual communities were looking inward, changing into a nation where there were organized cosmopolitan interests that dominated decision making in economics and politics. This was also a period when other groups employed public and political methods to exert their influence and to achieve order and justice.

To a greater degree than today the ballot symbolized democracy for American citizens and its possession signified inclusion in the political culture and in the

political community. It signified equality and this was why woman were so adamantly fighting for the right to vote because it meant that they would be included as political equals. This was also why black men were so staunchly defending their right to vote even in the context of the Jim Crow laws of the late 19th and early 20th century.

Women's suffrage. The women's campaign for suffrage grew out of the 19th century anti-slavery movement, because women working within the anti-slavery movement saw the inequalities of African Americans and the parallels in their own experiences as women. Once the slaves were freed they turned more to looking at their own rights. Americans believed in the natural rights of the people, but society was very slow to accept the fact that woman had public interests as individuals separate from their husbands or their fathers.

Party politics were seen as dirty and corrupt, not a place where women should want to be or participate in because it would bring them down. The suffragettes, however, argued that they would vote differently from men; that if they had the vote they would vote for clean streets and better schools and public agencies to take care of social problems. Anti-suffrage lobbyists were concerned that if women had the vote they would vote against alcohol and the brewing industry. You can clearly see the powerful lobby against women getting the right to vote organized by industries that thought that for moral reasons women would oppose them.

As an aside, it is not widely known that woman actually voted in the United States prior to 1920 in western states like Wyoming. That's because in order for those states to become states, they had to have a certain number of citizen population. To count women as citizens, they had to give them the right to vote. Also in many communities women had the right to vote in local elections and there they were exerting their influence on school legislation and things like that.

Party loyalties run very deep in the second half of the 19th century and in part this was driven by religious and ethnic identities and by memories of the civil war. If for example you were from the north or the west you were more likely to vote for the Republican Party; the party of Abraham Lincoln, the party that restored the union, the party that freed the slaves and freed women. If you were from the south, though, you were more likely to vote for the Democrats. If you were working class you were more likely to vote for the Democrats, too, or likewise if you were German or Irish Catholics. So there was an alignment there that came both from religious and ethnic background and class and the memories of the civil war.

Electoral politics were not the only way to influence government during this time. We also saw the rise of extra party organizations and associations in the late 19th century. Much of what happened in the late 19th century laid the foundation for the 20th century. For example, groups like labour unions became very strong in the late 19th century, often resorting to violence and protest to exert their influence. Farmers' alliances also became very strong in the 1880's and actually merged into a political movement known as populism in the 1890's. Populism was a grassroots political movement. It actually became a third party movement; a type of movement that in our country just can't win elections. But still third parties serve an important purpose. By bringing out new ideas and getting a lot of publicity and support for them at grassroots levels, the major parties are forced to co-opt or absorb the third party's ideas in order to get their constituencies to vote for them. The Farmer's alliances were very strong during this time because farmers didn't feel that their causes were being represented by either party.

There were also women's organizations that were very strong. The Women's Christian Temperance Union was one such large organization. Sometimes students will tell me the Suffrage Movement was the largest women's organization, but actually the Woman's Christian Temperance Union was by far larger and had much more influence than the suffrage organization did. Women influenced their husbands, they influenced their fathers. Not commonly known was they were not just solely interested in the campaign against drinking but they were also interested in other moral reforms.

These organizations used the press to influence the nation. The press was very powerful, especially newspapers because every single group had its own newspaper. Many of these only lasted for a year or so, because they never had enough money to go for years and years and years but they connected the people who believed in that particular idea for a time period.

Another form of influence at the time was itinerant lecturers who travelled across the country and who espoused these ideas. One of my favourite itinerant lecturers is a woman populist lecturer named Mary Allen Lee who was very charismatic. She was a populist lecturer who people referred to as Mary "Yellen" Lee. These lecturers could attract thousands of people to these other ideas.

As an historian I look back on the 1890's and see this as a decade of tremendous transition. But most Americans at that time were not aware of the significance of the changes that they were living through. We need to distance our perspective in order to understand the significance. Americans were, for example, living through a time of economic depression. There was a panic from 1893 to 1897 that was one of the most devastating economic depressions of the age. There were the Jim Crow laws that governed life of the African Americans in the south that, in effect, legislated racism. And there were also women without voting rights and many other major issues going on.

Increasingly, because of the conditions, Americans were starting to look to government for solutions. This was a major change from when Americans were very decentralized. But as the magnitude of some of the problems they were facing grew, people began to look for government solutions. For example, the Populists were calling for government regulations or even government ownership of railroads because they thought that would be fairer than the privately-owned companies that gave more favorable freight handling rates to corporate organizations than to individuals. Populists wanted the government to do something about the currency; they wanted the government to do something about working conditions which were totally unregulated. We will see this manifest itself in the progressive movement at the turn of the century.

The 1890's was also a watershed era in American foreign policy. The British were forced to recognize that the US was a paramount power in the western hemisphere and newly powerful banking and industrial groups in the United States were playing a role in shaping foreign policy. But now instead of finding markets for raw cotton or wheat which is what they had done for most of the 19th century, business was looking for customers for manufactured goods. Americans were looking for customers for textiles, for agricultural machinery, for locomotives, for sewing machines, for Kodak cameras; many of these manufactured goods. They were looking abroad for more markets, forcing American foreign policy to protect these markets in different parts of the world and cultivate them.

If land was acquired now, it wasn't solely acquired for additional farming but also for naval bases. So for example as a result of the Spanish American war the

United States acquired the territory of Hawaii and the Philippines and had naval bases there so that it could replenish ships that were going to China for trade.

In the 1890's America spawned a more centralized government apparatus to run foreign policy effectively. Domestic economic interest and foreign policy combined to build some of the first ships in the modern US Navy. We needed a great fleet in order to protect our growing interests overseas and of course that was fed by the nation's iron and steel industry. So Carnegie's US Steel Company became very intricately connected to the US Navy. All of this supported growth and we see the emergence of a military industrial alliance as a result of this.

Theodore Roosevelt was President from 1900 to 1908. You might remember him as the man who said "speak softly but carry a big stick." Roosevelt was a "rough rider" in the Spanish American war. He is a fascinating character because he was actually a very scrawny young man, you know. He was told that he wasn't going to have a healthy life, so as a young man he went west and he recovered his health in the west. Living in the outdoors, hunting, he became very healthy and went on to be a very robust man.

Theodore Roosevelt used diplomacy where he knew that war would be ineffective or where he thought that the US might not win the war. He negotiated with the Japanese over trade in China, for example in order to ensure that we had trade rights in China. On the other hand in 1904 or 1905 he used naval power with Santo Domingo to protect US banking interests.

Roosevelt's intervention and protection of developing markets set a precedent for President Woodrow Wilson who came into office in 1912. This was partly responsible for Wilson's decision to take the US into World War I in 1917. Wilson was a progressive, but one with a moral imperative. He was not only interested in expansion for economics' sake, but as a deeply moral man he was also motivated by the desire to be a full participant in the post war peace conference. He wanted to have a role in shaping the post war world. He truly believed in this concept of making the world safe for democracy and other interests.

But Wilson, as I mentioned, was a Progressive. We associate the Progressives from 1900 to 1920 with what we call the "Progressive Era." The Progressives were native born urban middle class professionals and protestants – WASPs, or White Anglo Saxon Protestants. They grew up rooted in an evangelical protestant tradition but in a period when science was becoming more and more important. The Progressives were less religious but they were motivated by those religious values that they grew up with and they turned to science as a way to achieve order and efficiency. One of their goals, for example, was to deliver the cities from sin. They wanted to get rid of prostitution, gambling and things like that. They wanted to see more efficiency. They developed the city manager system in cities; they sought efficiency in the workplace and safety. They wanted to eliminate the evils of big business while accepting capitalism.

They fought the evils of big business and trusts, developing anti-trust legislation to deal with monopolies in certain industries. They were paternalistic and protective, wanting to pass legislation to protect workers in the workplace. In the 19th and early 20th century, you see, many immigrant children were working in factories because the wages were so low every member of the family had to work in the factory and the children might just be earning pennies. What the Progressive Era reformers were interested in was getting children out of the workplace and into school where they could get an education and become better citizens and become more assimilated into the culture. Unfortunately, in the short run the immigrant families needed that

child's income in order to survive. This created a tension because the Progressive Era reformers had good intentions but there was also the fact that the immigrants couldn't survive without all the income.

The Progressives organized voluntary associations as a way to advance their cause. They investigated social problems scientifically, gathering and analyzing data, collecting statistics. Then they would propose solutions and popularize the problem and the solution through the media. Journalists who wrote these stories were called "muckraking" journalists. The term comes from the term muckrake that describes a character who rakes through the muck, the dregs, and pulled things out.

"The Jungle" written by Upton Sinclair at this time became very widely read. It was about the meat packing industry in Chicago and how an immigrant worker took her baby to the factory and how within a few seconds the baby almost becomes part of the meat product because there were no safety regulations. The book describes how all kinds of fingers and gloves and various things got into the food and how there was no regulation of the products that people were eating, on food and drugs. Muckraking stories like Sinclair's prompted a whole lot of legislation.

Another example of the Progressives' legacy stemmed from a 1911 incident in New York City. At that time there was a factory on the campus of New York University that was about 12 - 13 stories high. Near the end of the day on a Friday a fire broke out. Because there was no workplace regulation, all of the fire escapes and all of the exits except for the main exist were locked by the employer to keep the workers from taking breaks and from talking and so forth. If someone wanted to smoke, they would have to do so right in the factory. A fire started in all the waste that came from sewing and cutting fabrics and 146 women died, some of them by jumping to the street. As a result of this accident, more than a hundred pieces of protective legislation evolved to make workplace safety a matter of fact. So now, public places have emergency exits, and fire extinguishers.

This illustrates some of the Progressive Era legislation. This period also heralded a growing faith in government's ability and its knowledge to solve problems. There was a growing faith in experts – people who were trained, who were experts in government, who were able to bring about these laws.

For those of you who are interested in the women's story, women were very active in pioneering many of these efforts. The first generation of women college graduates from the period 1875 to 1900 would remain single, did not marry, and devoted their lives to this kind of work. They campaigned for child labor laws, they campaigned to established kindergartens. They crusaded against lynching of African Americans. They developed public health services so that children and mothers would have healthcare and other social services and in the process of doing this kind of reform work it awakened them politically and it renewed their desire to have the right to vote.

Now keeping in mind that the movement for the right to vote started in 1848, it was a long time to 1920. By 1900 or so the people who started that movement were getting old and their techniques were getting sort of routine. A new generation of women took over. Some of them had gone to England and had seen the militant suffragettes in England who were willing to go on hunger strikes and protest in the streets in order to get the right to vote. One of those who went to England came back and developed a rival group to the main suffrage group. This became known as the National Women's Party. During World War I, this group picketed the White House. They stood silently in front of the White House with signs that said "Kaiser Wilson, how long must we wait?" This was a very radical thing to do to picket the White

House during wartime. It looked very unpatriotic. Finally, Wilson couldn't take this any longer and the women were taken to a workhouse - the equivalent of a jail. As they went, more came in their place. Each time one was taken away, another arrived in her place. The women who were sent to the workhouse included women in their 70's. The oldest was about 78 and once they got into the workhouse they went on a hunger strike. When the press got word of these women who included powerful men's wives, the word got out and so finally Congress agreed to give the go ahead with the 19th amendment to give women the right to vote. Of course it had to be ratified state-by-state which it finally was but there is a wonderful story there about how these groups worked together to get women the right to vote: all part of the Progressive Era story.

The War era. I'm not going to talk about World War I itself except to say that World War I marked the end of the Progressive Era because there was a lot of disillusionment after that war. Following World War I, Washington policy makers used the US's immense financial resources to rebuild the world along capitalist lines. US bankers and capitalists worked to capture overseas markets. They wanted these markets to be free and they wanted no government interference. Today we refer to this as an era of independent internationalism. They felt the more autonomy they had, the easier it would be to develop world trade.

American leaders believed that the nation's welfare depended on a healthy international system and Herbert Hoover who was President in 1921 said the American system of American individualism cannot be preserved in domestic life if it must be abandoned in our international life. So he appealed to one of those core values of American individualism in saying that we must also have it in international life.

The roaring 20's. The 1920's was a period of a great economic boom. Even ordinary citizens were investing in the stock market. But while it looked very prosperous, there were pockets of people who were not prosperous. Farmers were not doing well in the 1920's, for example. There was a post war depression for farmers. African Americans in the south also continued with the same conditions. But for many Americans the 20's were quite prosperous and as I said they invested with confidence in the stock markets. They were so confident that they even borrowed money in order to invest in the stock market. It was also a period of great consumption; a period when department stores spread and mass culture spread - radio, movies, automobiles. The 1920's changed many people's lives; the way they lived, recreated and dressed. But this boom was speculative and by 1929 the New York Money Market weakened from over speculation and world economic markets were suffering from the same tendency and so we had the crash in the Fall of 1929.

The great depression. The crash of the stock market created a panic and a run on banks ensued. The economy was out of control. America and the world plummeted into a decade of economic depression, leading to a US unemployment rate of 25%. Currently our unemployment rate is 4 to 6%, something like that. It varies from state to state. So for my students to read about one fourth of the country being unemployed they are just shocked. It is just hard for them to comprehend.

Because of the problems of the great depression and a drought in the nation's bread basket, many farmers couldn't make their payments and many people became landless. If you have seen the film "The Grapes of Wrath" or read the book by John Steinbeck, you'll understand what it was like for people who were forced off their land and who went west to become migrant workers. What that book illustrates well is that California became saturated, even to the point of trying to turn people away at

the borders. What could these people do? In the south, the share croppers were failing as well.

So in response to this great need, President Franklin D. Roosevelt came up with the New Deal. The New Deal was a series of programs in 2 parts. First, to provide immediate relief to Americans and then to reform some of the structural problems in the American system. With the New Deal, people began to look increasingly to the government for aid. People referred to his programs as the new deal “alphabet soup” with agencies like the CCC and AAA and WCA and the PWA and TVA and NRA and I could go on and on. But many unemployed young men on the street with nothing to do were gathered up in the CCC and put to work planting trees. They were taken to the countryside. Camps were set up for them to stay in. They worked to prevent erosion; they built things, working with the natural landscape and in national parks they built trails and things like that. In all, it was a very healthy environment. They were getting fed. They were getting sheltered. They were working. They were improving the country in some way and they were getting paid a little something that they could send back home to their families. That was one program.

There were many other programs that I could go into. The PWA (Public Works Administration) built bridges and dams and many other structures. The TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority) brought electricity to a region of the nation that didn’t have it before. Regulatory changes also were introduced such as the need for depositors’ insurance for private bank accounts, and banking regulation and oversight. Another great piece of legislation that came out of the new deal that still affects every American today is social security. This is a national old age benefit when you get to be 62 or 65, giving you a pension to live on. Today in the United States this is a controversial issue because it is so costly to do this and there is this discussion of social security going bankrupt.

A changing relationship between governed and governor. The main point here is that people’s attitudes toward government changed during this time adding an expectation of what government was going to do for you.

Another thing that happened during this period of the great depression was that America turned inwards. America was focusing on its internal problems and was trying to address those problems. There was the growth of isolationism as the nation focused inwards. Charles Lindbergh, who flew across the Atlantic Ocean in 1927, became a celebrity figure in the United States. He also became involved in a movement that was known as “America First.”

Franklin D Roosevelt was elected an unprecedented 4 times.¹ After his election for the third term, FDR started to move the nation slowly to war. He could see what was happening on the world scene, but with Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, America became involved in a total war; a war that involved nearly every American citizen – from men, women, children, all races, everything. Native Americans went into the service and, using native languages like Navajo, became code talkers in intelligence. African Americans also went into the service even though the troops were segregated. African Americans fought to prove their equality and to fight for democracy as well. Women went to work in defence plants; as many as 6 million women. They become known as “Rosie the Riveters.” Women’s wages rose significantly during this period. Even children got involved in

¹ The last President to serve more than the traditional two terms. The 20th amendment to the Constitution now precludes a third term.

the war effort. They went out and collected scrap metal, rubber tires, all kinds of things. Everyone bought saving bonds and saving stamps to support the war effort.

Total war, then, meant that everyone felt they were doing something to contribute to the war. I have to share this one little story because the question of South African soapies came up. In the United States during World War II, radio soap operas were very popular. An office called the “office of war information” used the soaps by breaking in during the program having the actors talk about how they were conserving waste fat so it could be used to make bombs, for example, and the little boy would run into the house and he would say “mother, look at the scrap metal I collected for the war effort.” Whole scripts were filled with suggestions about the behavior that you were supposed to have.

I should say that women who went to work as Rosie the Riveters really were changed. At the end of the war they polled women and asked them how many of them would like to continue working? Eighty percent of them said they wanted to keep their jobs. This posed a real problem because with the demobilization of all the soldiers, those jobs were going to be in demand. So a lot of messages were then broadcast promoting the idea that women needed to go home; to build families and take care of the men who were coming back. A key way to get women out of the work force was the media message “if you stay in the work force your children would become juvenile delinquents.” Many African American women also played active roles in the defense industry as well and it significantly improved their economic status, too.

After World War II we entered the Cold War era that would span from 1945 to 1989. It was essentially a clash between 2 systems, two different ways of viewing the world. From the US perspective there was a belief in democracy, and of course Americans believed in capitalism. The USSR practiced collectivism, communism. The values collided head on. In the US, we value the individual freedoms necessary for a capitalist society and in the USSR there was opposition to individual freedom. President Truman in 1947 said “freedom of worship and freedom of speech are related to freedom of enterprise.” That’s an indication of how closely linked our freedom of enterprise is to capitalism.

The Cold War never erupted into a direct military conflict, per se, but both sides spent a great deal on nuclear preparedness. And the Cold War fed everyday fears. It also shaped foreign policy and I want to talk about both of these things for just a few minutes.

As far as feeding everyday fears went, when we dropped the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki most Americans had no conception of what an atomic bomb was because this weapon was developed in absolute secrecy. A very fascinating popular culture arose as a result of this, about which my mentor at Wisconsin Paul Boyer has written a wonderful book called “By the Bomb’s Early Light.” In it, he reviews the changing reactions to the idea of the atomic bomb during the Cold War era. He found some fascinating things, such as when children opened their cereal boxes in the late 40’s and early 50’s they might receive a free “atomic decoder ring” toy. I have seen photographs of a general’s wife wearing an atomic bomb hat: a hideous thing, but what is even worse is that in this photograph this woman is standing next to an atomic bomb cake.

At first, Americans did not “get” the significance of the atomic bomb. Life Magazine featured a woman who they called an “atomic bomb” in a bathing suit. Everywhere you look during that period, you can see this concept of atomic bombs filtering through popular culture.

While this popular fascination with the bomb, there was also a growing understanding and comprehension of the bomb's power. As scientists started to deal with their consciences they began characterizing the bomb as sinister, imparting this sense of a ticking clock, this atomic clock; a clock that is ticking that could be bringing about the end of the world.

I grew up in a climate of fear; that two powers could destroy one another and the entire world. We believed that the USSR might drop a bomb on us anytime. We grew up with the sense that in the White House there was a special telephone, a "red phone" that was linked somehow to sending a bomb to Russia.

When I was a child I was so paranoid about the end of the world that I remember writing a letter to Khrushchev asking him not to destroy us. My mother didn't mail it of course but we saw Premier Khrushchev of the USSR as mad and unreliable. It was a very scary period. This was a time of "duck and cover" films shown to American children of what do you do if an atomic bomb was on its way. The films had this little turtle that pulled himself into his shell and then showed little children what they were supposed to do if they saw a flash in the sky. Like if I saw a flash in the sky right now I would run over there, I would get under the table or I would crouch against the wall and cover my face.

Then there were bomb shelters. People built bomb shelters that they thought would protect them. Life Magazine again did a fascinating spread on the bomb shelter. It showed a man and a woman who had just gotten married spending their honeymoon in the bomb shelter. What makes the film even more of a classic is that arrayed around them were the consumer goods they received as wedding presents – the toasters and consumer goods of the 1950's.

One film I use with my class is called "Doctor Strangelove." It stars Peter Sellers, but it humorously focuses on what happens when a bomb accidentally sets off. I use the film to try to get across the idea of the fear that permeated the time period. This fear drove the military industrial complex in the United States and as I said it also shaped our foreign policy.

Our foreign policy of this time period was one of "containment." This held that we must "contain" communism's spread. We believed at this time in the "domino theory," that as one country fell to communism that the next country would follow suit and in this way, key countries might fall to communism. This is why Ronald Reagan in the 80's could refer to the USSR as an "evil empire" and why Americans would connect with that concept. The fear of communism in the 1950's made it possible for a Wisconsin Senator named Eugene McCarthy to accuse many people of being communists, leading to the "McCarthy era" in the early 1950's. McCarthyism had an impact on Hollywood, too ruining many film actors' careers when they were put on "blacklists" because they were associated with being communists.

I will give one personal example. One of my mentors at the University of Wisconsin was named Girda Learner (sic). Girda Learner was a Jewish refugee who married a film producer and they moved to Hollywood in the 30's and 40's. She was a talented writer who wrote the screenplay for a film called "Black Like Me," one that was seen as sympathetic to communism because it is preaching racial equality. She was blacklisted. She was also called before some groups² that accused her of being a communist. While a number of Americans had joined the communist party, many did

² Such groups might have included the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee.

not do so necessarily for political reasons as much as for social reasons. There were also those who believed in the communist party program – caring for their neighbour – that whole collective idea.

A new Culture. During the 1950's, teenagers started to assert their independence and rebel against authority. You might think about that as being a 1960's thing, but when you look at the 1950's, what popular culture figures come to mind? Elvis Presley. Rock and roll. James Dean, an actor who was defying authority. The whole idea of wearing blue jeans started to develop. This era was a warm-up for the student protests of the 1960's.

Now, I don't want you to think this was an entire decade of fear; the 50's were also a decade of many positive developments. Personally, I'm not very much into consumerism, but this was a development period of consumer culture. Many consumer goods became available to Americans who had lived through a decade of economic depression and half a decade of war during which they were sacrificing everything for the war effort. There were no baby beds; my brother didn't have a baby bed because all of the supplies were being diverted to the war effort. People couldn't buy new cars because the metal was being diverted to the war effort and so forth.

There was, then, a pent up hunger for consumer goods. After the war ended, the defense plants were reconverted to produce consumer goods. So you had the goods and the hunger for them and the money for them, partly because during the war people were buying all of those savings bonds. And remember 6 million women had been working so they had saved a lot of money. So a big consumer period erupted then. It was a time when people redefined the "American dream."

This was also a period when government policies were impacting on individual life. The General Infantry Bill (GI bill) was passed at this time. The GI bill provided two important things that helped feed this culture of the 1950's: First, it provided government loans for housing. Part of the idea of the "American dream" was to own your own home and so the government provided loans for housing, especially to veterans. Between 1940 and 1960 home ownership went up from 42% of the population to 62% of the population owning homes and a lot of this is attributed to the GI bill.

Now you get your home and of course you have children, right? Following the war there was a baby boom. We are living with the effect of this baby boom today as our baby boomers are starting to age and putting greater demands on our healthcare system in our country.

At this early post war time, the suburbs spring up, there was "standardization" of culture. Suburbs built in the 1950's were very uniform. Norman Rockwell drew a picture of a man driving home after work into his community and he doesn't know in which house he lives in because they all look alike.

The baby boom also had an impact on schools, requiring more schools for the children. Today, there are not as many children, and some schools are closing. During this period, we also experienced the arrival of a phenomenon known as "white flight." As people built their homes in the suburbs, much of the white population moved out of the cities into the suburbs. This had and is having an impact on American culture. Another trend that we are dealing with today is the revitalizing of inner cities, with yuppies moving back to the inner cities.

A second aspect of the GI bill was the GI bill for higher education that gave us a new generation of technically skilled graduates. This is important in our understanding of many of the developments coming out in the late 50's and 60's.

Developments in computing, technology and electronics and the automotive industry came from people who were trained under the GI bill. Many veterans were able to go back and get an education that otherwise would not have been able to.

Civil rights. Hidden in the story of the affluent 1950's is the civil rights movement. The media helped make many Americans aware of racism in this country. In 1947, Jackie Robinson broke the color line in major league baseball. The navy desegregated in World War II; the army desegregated during the Korean conflict. President Truman actively supported civil rights. President Eisenhower was not as supportive; nonetheless during the Eisenhower administration we saw the Brown versus the Board of Education case in which the Supreme Court in 1954 ruled that separate but equal is unequal. What is fascinating to me is that they're now finding that some areas are re-segregating just on their own. Schools are reverting to primarily black schools and primarily white schools after all of this bussing and other attempts to integrate schools, but it is taking place along different lines now. It is not just race but now is much more based on class.

During this period, we saw Rosa Parks who got on the bus and refused to move to the back in 1955. We saw the Montgomery Bus boycott which grew out of Rosa Parks's actions lasting more than 300 days in Montgomery, Alabama, during which blacks refused to ride the bus. Martin Luther King of course emerged as a civil rights movement leader out of the Montgomery bus boycott.

When we think of the civil rights movement, we often think mainly about the national figures; people like Martin Luther King, Malcolm X and the Black Panthers. One of the important things to remember is the thousands of small town ministers, teachers, workers and others who put their lives on the line in order to see that African Americans got the right to vote.

We look at the college students who went from the north to the south as "freedom riders" and who participated in lunch counter "sit-ins." Many Jewish college students went south to work in the civil rights movement. It is really important to look at those. When I teach this in my class, one of the texts that I use is Ann Moody's "Coming of Age in Mississippi," a tremendously powerful book. It is written from the perspective of a young black woman who was involved in the civil rights movement. It is written in a language that changes as she grows from underprivileged poor black woman and gets education and goes to college and becomes active in the civil rights movement. She finally flees the south because she is on a hit list. In the end she becomes disillusioned with Martin Luther King and his tactics of non-violence and you know his Ghandi-like approach to civil rights and she leaves the civil rights movement.

When I teach this book I have my students write a reflection in several parts. One thing is I ask them is to choose two passages from the book that really affect them and explain to me why these passages affect them. They usually pick one in which the author is being beaten up; something that they relate to. Then I ask them to reflect on if they had lived at the time, would they have participated in the civil rights movement? Now, some of them are liberal white students and most of them are white students, not all of them, but some of them will say "oh yes, I would have participated in the movement." But the ones who are thinking more deeply say "I wish I could say I would have participated in the movement but the reality is I would have been too afraid or my parents would not have let me." I appreciate the fact that it forces them to come to terms with the decisions that the actual participants had to make.

John F Kennedy's term as President was cut short because of his assassination. He was actually fairly conservative in terms of the civil rights movement. But he was

forced to take some action. He was preparing to put forward the Civil Rights Act which was passed in 1964 after his assassination. What also grew out of the Civil Rights Act was a study of black economic problems which found that 40% of American blacks were living below the poverty level in 1963.

Lyndon Johnson, who succeeded Kennedy as President had huge domestic programs like Medicare - that's a kind of medical care for people 62 and older and Head Start - a program for children before they go to school to make sure that even poor children are going to get good nutrition and care, adult job training for elementary and secondary education. This was a time of great expenditures for higher education. This was an introductory time for clean air and water regulations.

Those were some of the "great society" programs passed under the Johnson Presidency. But Johnson had little experience with foreign affairs and in the context of the Cold War and the context of McCarthyism he feared being accused of being "weak on communism." Johnson pursued his social agenda at a time when we were also beginning our engagement in Vietnam. We had only military advisors in Vietnam at the outset. Johnson realised that if he didn't step up our involvement in Vietnam that he would be seen as being weak on communism. The American involvement in Vietnam eventually led LBJ to lose support for his great society programs and in fact to lose support for himself as more and more American soldiers came home in body bags. Vietnam marked a turn from Johnson to a shift toward people reasserting "traditional values." This move to conservatism as a result of our involvement in Vietnam affected the voters in the 1968 election, allowing in Richard Nixon, A Republican. Nixon ran on restoring morality, law and order and of course on "bringing our boys home from Vietnam." Nixon won two elections. Despite the Watergate scandal, the conservative trend in the country persisted, in part, dominated by religious values. You could say that when Jimmy Carter became President, he did so on a platform of personal morality. Moral values can be seen in politics to this day, with the "moral majority" and Ronald Reagan in the 80's.

To conclude, I would point out that it can be hard to make sense of all these contradictory developments in 20th century American life. For millions it was a time of great prosperity and a better lifestyle. By 1990, half of all law school graduates were women. Segregation of public facilities is abolished. We see a persistence of traditional values, religion and family. We see a replay of the ideas of individualism that we have talked about from the very beginning. We see continued upward mobility. We also see a persistence of problems: poverty drives racism and yet we are a world super power. How do we resolve all of these contradictory developments in the 20th century history? Perhaps that is a question for my reflector to reflect on.

South African Reflection by Prof Jackie Grobler, History/UP

PROF GROBLER: When reflecting on the course of the 20th century it is always important to identify the forces that shaped the century. There are forces that can be shaped by the community itself and some that are beyond the control of a community. You will remember, for example, the landing on the moon was within the control of the American people, and so was the decision to launch the new deal by President Roosevelt in 1933. The civil rights struggle and the emancipation of women was, in my opinion, not as easy to control by the white male ruling class. I presume it occurred in spite of them in a certain sense.

Then there were events that had a massive impact on American history which were quite unforeseen and quite beyond their control and had a massive impact. Pearl

Harbor was an extremely negative event. Then much more positive, the end of the Cold War, as a result of the collapse of the Soviet Union. I doubt that Americans in 1988 could predict that within 3 years there would no longer be a Cold War.

Now in Southern Africa we've also had a vast variety of forces that have shaped the course of the history of this subcontinent. Examples are the onset of colonialism, the mining revolution, the anti-colonial or anti-apartheid struggles that were waged in different parts of our subcontinent.

The important thing is how the communities in all cases reacted to these events and developments. The reaction was diverse, sometimes uniting people at other times dividing people. This holds true for both the United States and South Africa. Americans were certainly divided by the Vietnam War. On the other hand when Nixon was President Americans were extremely united in condemning the Watergate scandal.

The passive exposition of the movements and developments in the United States in the beginning of the 20th century is of course unique to the United States. Southern Africa was at that stage not a political unity. There were in Southern Africa temperance movements, there were millennium movements religious/church movements, some of which had links with similar movements in the United States and there were Americans who visited South Africa as a result of these links and South Africans also visited the United States but the influence across the Atlantic was very superficial.

Now listening to Professor Passet one is struck by the very small contact between Southern Africa and the United States at the beginning and early decades of the 20th century and also by the massive similarities between the South African communities and US communities at this time. This was of course before the era of globalization in the 21st century meaning of the word. South Africa had its own unique problems. The majority of the people of South Africa were probably in the same situation as African Americans rather than the American, generally speaking, white community that were usually referred to as the "American community" especially in older textbooks that we studied on American history.

The only people in South Africa in the first third of the 20th century who generally speaking had the vote were white males with some exceptions in especially the Cape Province. In many areas in South Africa nobody had the vote at all. There was a women's suffrage movement in the white community in the early part of the 20th century and some prominent but generally speaking extremely conservative women participated in this. One example of which I'm aware is that of Johanna Brand. She came from a well-to-do Afrikaner family but nevertheless participated in this suffrage movement. She also visited the United States at this time early in the century around the 1920's and she had a large following in the United States as a result of her writings on natural health including a book titled "The Grape Cure." She had as far as I could establish no contact with American suffragists. So the South African women's movement and the American women's movement as far as I am aware again had no links whatsoever. The bottom line is that the South African women's suffrage movement was a white movement and not militant at all. I'm not aware of any black woman participating in this movement in the beginning of the century now that is the 20th century.

The great depression of 1929 had a massive impact on South Africa and certainly influenced the whole community negatively. The reason, of course, being that the world markets virtually collapsed and this had a huge impact on gold mining from which many South Africans directly or indirectly made a living. However South

Africa was at the time of the great depression already in the grip of a depression at the time. There was already in South Africa a huge unemployment problem. There was another problem called the poor white problem in the 1920's that started much earlier.

In the late 1920's this poor white problem was investigated by a Commission financed by none other than the Carnegie Corporation of New York.³ There was also a so-called poor black problem probably much more devastating than the poor white problem. This was also investigated well at the end of the 1920s by what was called the Natives Economic Commission appointed in 1930. The Chairman of that Commission, Dr. Jack Holloway, visited the United States to make a comparative study of poverty amongst black Americans and poverty amongst black South Africans. Now both the Carnegie Commission (sic) and to a lesser extent the Holloway Commission believed that the solution to these problems would be the rehabilitation of rural South Africa.

A huge rural rehabilitation scheme was launched in 1934 to assist the poor whites. It failed. And then for the next few years virtually nothing happened in attempt to alleviate these problems up to the outbreak of the Second World War when South Africa in common with the United States was, economically speaking, positively impacted. That of course goes for Southern Africa and not only South Africa. South Africa and the United States were the only states in the world that came out of the war much better off than when they went into the war.

Now Professor Passet also told us that nearly every American was behind the war effort in the Second World War. This was certainly not the case in South Africa. I cannot say what the influence of the war was on other Southern African countries in addition to South Africa. As for South Africa, as happened in the United States many women became involved both in the women's auxiliary forces, in the armed forces itself or as factory workers. However virtually all these women were white. Black women remained farm workers or domestic workers at this time. All were not workers in the sense of working for a salary at all.

Throughout the Cold War era South Africa was a staunch supporter of the United States. Initially all other Southern African regions were in the same boat meaning they were also staunch supporters of the United States since they were colonies of powers allied to the United States. Now as the decolonization process got under way, some of these states that became independent switched sides and joined the Soviet block in the Cold War. But it didn't happen to all the states. Again this is not my field of speciality at all but I'm fairly certain that Botswana never officially took the side of the Soviet Union in the Cold War.

South Africa's alliance with the United States in the Cold War had a massive impact on the subcontinent since Cold War divisions soon entered this part of the world. As happened elsewhere in the world for example in Vietnam anti-colonial forces allied themselves to the Soviet Union and the authorities in South Africa specifically branded all their enemies as communists as did McCarthy in the United States itself as Professor Passet pointed out to us. South Africa also thus became a victim of the massive global anti-communist propaganda campaign of the United States.

Now Professor Passet has pointed out to us the propaganda campaign within the United States. Many anti-Soviet movies made their way to South Africa and I can remember as a kid and as a young man seeing many of those movies in our movie

³ Not clear from transcript.

houses and our drive-in theatres of those days. We read Life Magazine and the Saturday Evening Post and white South Africans at least generally speaking believed the domino theory and we were aware of what it meant and what it stood for.

Many South African opponents of the government were, as happened in the United States, blacklisted as communists and this was officially done. It was not just a sort of propaganda thing in newspapers. Since we had an act called the Suppression of Communism Act passed by the Parliament in 1950 and in terms of this Act virtually any opponent of the government be it a communist or not could be listed as a communist since they are opposed to government and advanced the cause of communism.

Now not all of these people were blacks. Professor Passet pointed out to us some young musicians in the United States who started opposing the stance of the government in the Cold War. In South Africa we had some young members of very prominent Afrikaner families who also reacted against the Cold War propaganda and against the government's support of the United States in the Cold War, examples being Braam Fischer (sic). He came from a very prominent Free State Afrikaner family. Beyers Naude, came from a very prominent Dutch Reformed church family and Breyten Breytenbach who also came from a quite prominent family not as prominent as Fischer or Naude but nevertheless prominent. And then we had numerous authors, not so many musicians who I can think of, in the same community usually that supported the government.

These people in the 1950s until the 1960s came out as opponents of government policy. Another prominent one who stood out in his criticism even though he called himself a "loyal critic" was the author M P van Wyk Louw (sic). I believe he received some recognition by President Mbeki recently.⁴ H31

Prominent black leaders were also branded in South Africa as communists - as Fidel Castro was by the Eisenhower administration - when he was certainly not yet a communist. Some people during this period were branded communists before they actually became communists. This group included Nelson Mandela, and the US government certainly approved of this. When Mandela and the other Rivonia trialists were persecuted in the early 1960's a retired American Supreme Court Judge officially represented the US Government at the trial and reported back to the Johnson administration that the outcome and sentence was "fair and in accordance with law." This opinion was not approved by all members of the Department of State, including Madelein Albright who later became the Secretary of State herself but at that time she was a very junior official.

A remarkable phenomenon in the negative sense of the word is the limited impact that the civil rights movement in the United States had on events in Southern Africa. To explain this is not easy but I will attempt. One reason might be that the media in South Africa gave very little prominence to the civil rights movement and as a result few South Africans really knew about it. A second reason might be that Martin Luther King promoted non-violence at the very time that the ANC adopted the arms struggle as a tactic in the anti-apartheid campaign. A third reason might be that black South Africans had only a very limited knowledge of the United States and of course then also of the civil rights movement. Black South Africans also of course had other issues to concentrate on, namely simply surviving from day to day. The civil rights movement could as far as the majority of them were concerned just as well have taken place on Mars or Venus or Saturn or somewhere else in the wide universe.

⁴ Van Luouw received the ***** award by President Mbeki on *****

Now we must also note that the absence of TV in South Africa up to 1975 had a huge impact on what we knew about the United States and after 1975 up to 1990 the government had virtually absolute control of TV in South Africa so what we then learned about the United States was what the government allowed us to know. This negative phenomenon cannot be over estimated in studying US South African links.

Before TV the United States was extremely distant from South Africa. We saw some movies about the United States. Now we still see movies about the United States and those of you who are Southern Africans who have visited the United States will know that you get something completely different from what you expect when you arrive in the United States. The same is true with Americans when they arrive in South Africa. One professor from Georgia State University told me that 7 or 8 hours after arriving in South Africa he could not imagine that he is not in the United States, it's virtually the same here. Of the university he said, "You've got a great library, you've got e-mail and all your stuff is highly technical, your roads are excellent, your shopping malls, everything. It's not what I expected."

Now the same is true with South Africans when they arrive in the United States. They expect to find different people. They don't expect to find ordinary human beings. Before 1975 it was even worse. We knew really nothing about the United States. Adding to this deficit was the academic boycott of South Africa as a result of American reaction to the government policies of apartheid. This resulted in what I called an artificial "Berlin wall" between the American and South African communities. Most statements made by South Africans on the United States were made in ignorance as were statements made by Americans about South Africa. We didn't know anything about each other. Fortunately we have to a large extent been freed from artificial barriers and know we can start working on breaking down our mutual ignorance as we are doing at this workshop.

Question and answer session

COMMENT: Regarding your comment about us not knowing anything about the United States before 1975. Just wanted to remind about our popular culture in the early part of the century based around American film. There were the gangsters, the jazz. So I think one should remember that there were some influences in addition to the ignorance.

QUESTION: When Prof Grobler referred to the fact that the civil rights movement didn't really have an impact on South Africa, weren't political parties in South Africa influenced by that U.S. movement? Wasn't the ANC that was established in the early 1900's linked to Pan-Africanism and the whole movement coming from southern American countries as well as the northern Americas?

PROF GROBLER: The establishment of the ANC took place way before the civil rights movement. But events in the United States did have an influence. Again it was not an absolute separation; there was some crossover. But it was just very superficial. A good example of this was professor Z.K. Matthews of the Cape ANC who visit the United States regularly from the 1940's onward and especially in 1952 and he came back with the idea of holding a "Congress of the People" to formulate the freedom charter.

Now, that could be perceived as "influence by the United States." Before his time, ANC President Zuma was living in the United States for a while and he married an American woman. So there were definitely influences. One of the big mysteries of South African history is the influence of the United States on the formation of the

PAC in 1959 since the founding meeting of the PAC was held at the PAN African Congress of South Africa in the offices of the U.S. Information Agency in Johannesburg; in the boardroom there. But why? I studied this extensively. A doctoral student who did a doctorate on the founding of the PAC couldn't find an answer to that either and unfortunately I've tried to find the archives of the South African Embassy in Washington DC but nobody knows where it is or where all those documents are which might throw some light on this. The papers in the United States which I studied at both the Eisenhower library and the National Archives of the United States in Maryland couldn't answer that.

The Black Conscience Movement of the late 60's/early 70's - Steve Biko's group - were to a certain extent influenced by events in the United States but not so much by the civil rights movement as by the culture of black Americans. For example the slogan "black is beautiful."

There might be other examples as well but I don't think there was such a big influence of events in the United States on the formation of political groups in South Africa.

QUESTION: In Professor Passet's presentation, she was constantly referring to how certain values become dominant in the U.S. and the factors driving those values. But when you look at America now, what is the balance between maybe conservative values and liberal values and how would you explain that?

PROF PASSET: What is the balance between conservative values and liberal values? I think it's not a balance right now. I think that it is a very difficult question because I would say there are people who are politically conservative whom may have liberal social values. There are people who are politically liberal who might have some conservative social values. You know people are very contradictory. The labels are hard to use, although when we are talking about the change in political climate in the United States after the Johnson administration you do see a move towards embracing more traditional values. The concept of the family individual life, the sanctity of human life, all of these issues become very politicized and it's a give and take.⁵

QUESTION: For both South Africa and United States especially in the period during the Second World War and immediately after the war, what other experiences in terms of sex roles and the deconstruction and the construction of families during this period? Professor Grobler has done some study on the war period in the case of South Africa but I haven't seen any serious studies on the issue of sex and the construction or deconstruction of families.

PROF PASSET: I didn't have enough time to get into this, but World War II and the advent of 6 million women moving into the workplace during World War II begin to break down gender stereotypes. Women started to wear pants. Moral values began to change. For example, my mother was a civil servant during World War II and she was talking about the women she worked with and how a number of the women she worked with had abortions. My mother said it was quite common. Many women were consorting with soldiers who sometimes they weren't their husbands and so the sexual values were changing at that time.

During the 1950's you see a reassertion of the stereotypical gender role and I think at least about 90% of women who were marrying in the 1950's were doing so out of peer pressure. Out of the experience of working during war and out of the experience of the 1950's many women had had a taste of freedom. Even though the

⁵ For a full treatment of the Liberal/Conservative values balance, see Political Culture H32

50's were prosperous for us, women felt a growing unhappiness with their more restricted roles. At this time, Betty Friedan (sic) H33 wrote a ground breaking book for feminists called "The Feminine Must Speak" that focused on this phenomenon. She surveyed the graduates of Smith College where she had attended and she was finding that there were many women who were well educated who were not satisfied just to be at home.

For many women of that generation, it was too late because they were past that point where they could go out and get training and do other things. But they instilled in their daughters a strong interest in achievement, education, and activism. It is in their daughters that we see the women's movement in the 1960's.

The women's movement of the 1960's actually grew out of the civil rights movement as well, because it was in the civil rights movement that women's awareness of their subordinate status was heightened. They also resented being told to make the coffee and make the sandwiches and things like that during their protest. They wanted to be on the front line with everyone else.

Out of these experimentations came a renewal of feminism in the 1960's and we saw it institutionalized in a couple of organizations and became known popularly as the Women's Liberation Movement and from that you see a great deal of advance for women. As a personal example, when I was in high school and I played basketball but we were only allowed to play half court basketball because it was seen to be "too strenuous for us to run the whole court." After the civil rights bill of 1964, Federal money was given for women to participate in sport and so young women who graduated after I did had the advantage of having athletic activities for themselves and they changed to full court basketball.

We still haven't equalized women's wages. Women earn about 75 cents on the dollar that a man earns. But the point I want to make is that there were many battles, there were many gains. Today's young women students on college campuses do not recognize that the battles are not all finished and so in class when we talk about feminism they will say "I'm not a feminist" disdainfully. They usually also say how they believe that they need certain rights - but they want to distance themselves from the label of feminism because it has become such a contentious label for many.

QUESTION: Professor Grobler, was there any specific reason why only the whites and not black women were employed during the second world war?

PROF GROBLER: I haven't done a lot of research on this, but from what I have picked up about South African history at this time it is quite clear that in the armed forces only white women were used in the women's auxiliary forces probably because of the segregation legislation that was still in force at that time. It was before the era of apartheid which started in 1948. In the economy in general, I really can't say.

QUESTION: What about Japanese internment? I would like you to just clarify how historians viewed Japanese internment during World War II. And also, what about US foreign policy towards Cuba and the ongoing embargo against Cuban imports and exports? Is that a legacy of the Cold War that needs to be removed?

PROF PASSET: Okay I have to say in terms of US foreign policy towards Cuba I am not an expert in foreign policy. So I think you are probably correct in saying it is a legacy of the Cold War.

The story of Japanese American internment is a story that has not been widely publicized in many of the elementary and secondary school history textbooks. In fact I routinely assign a book called "Desert Exile" by a woman named Uchida. H34 It is a first person account by a young woman whose family was interned. Students

usually tell me they've never heard of this before. They had no idea their country ever did this to anyone and they are always shocked by it.

Young people and many people my age are horrified that the United States interned Japanese Americans. People of the World War II era generation, though, believe it was necessarily because they were very fearful of an attack from within or on the Pacific coast. I recently interviewed a World War II veteran who served in the Horse Calvary which surprisingly still existed at the time of World War II. He said they were transported with their horses to the West coast to search for Japanese who had gone inland. These cavalry soldiers honestly believed they were going to be killed. They believed there was going to be guerrilla warfare on the ground with these Japanese that supposedly infiltrated. Fear, as you can see, dominated that time and place.

One of the things that comes through in the book *Desert Exile* is the amazing resilience on the part of the Japanese Americans and Japanese who were in these camps. They recreated their communities, their institutions, their lifestyles. There was some resistance on the part of some men and others volunteered for the military. Still others refused because they couldn't forswear allegiance to Japan but anyway the country has paid reparations to the Japanese Americans. Although you can never repay someone for the loss of time and so forth.

QUESTION: I could argue that World War II started in 1939 and the US entered this in 1941 as a result of Pearl Harbor. So couldn't you conclude that the superpower status of the US is undeserved? By the time of Pearl Harbor, after all, Great Britain and France were devastated.

PROF PASSET: I would say that most Americans would disagree with that argument, most American historians, anyway, because even though the US did not enter until 1941 it was totally committed from that point forward until the end of the war and put great resources into the war and so I think that I can see how you might construct that argument but I'm not sure that there is enough evidence to fully support it.

QUESTION: I disagree with Dr. Jackie Grobler's points about South African history. First of all, American missionaries played a major role in the South African civil education program of the 1880's and I think you can see a major evolution of influence of the US in South African black communities that had a profound effect on people's attitudes and impressions.

The American missionary influence in South Africa was through the school set-up for black girls and women in the 1880's. The development of Adam's Mission College brought high school education to some of the most senior leaders within the African continent. They got their education there.

The reference to the civil rights movement in the US and the impact of that on the struggle of politics in South Africa I think at one layer is controlled information. I know the books of doctor Martin Luther King were banned in South Africa but the underground movement had access to all of those and they were studied quite seriously.

The issue of USSR and its influence and support for the liberation struggle in South Africa was substantial. But the exiled communities in different ways travelled in all directions and got that support. Even though the South African government and the American government termed the African National Congress a terrorist organization they also helped turn the history.

PROF GROBLER: Thank you of course I could have given you a two hour lecture on the influence the links between South Africa and the United States but I was only asked to comment and I made only a few comments that I thought was applicable to what Professor Passet had said. I can assure you that I'm aware of what you have just said. I wrote a book on black politics in South Africa way back in 1988 and I know what it is about.

My comment on the limits of the civil rights impact on the liberation struggle here reflects mainly the struggle within South Africa itself. Most people in South Africa itself had virtually no knowledge of it. After answering one of the first questions. Steve Biko was definitely more under the influence of Malcolm X than under Martin Luther King. In his writings one gets numerous references to the Black Panther movement and their ideology and very little on Martin Luther King. In other words, there was influence but it was very superficial.